

REMARKS

In the last Office Action, the Examiner withdrew claim 42 from further consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 1, 38 and 43-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yates (USPN 4,173,169). Claims 2 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yates in view of Raville (USPN 3,656,249). Claims 37 and 47 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yates in view of In re Kuhle, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975). Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yates in view of Roy (USPN 3,756,120). Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardelli Model 60 (pg. 85) in view of Litchman (USPN 4,342,169). Claims 40-41, 43-36 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardelli Model 60 in view of Lichtman and further in view of Albercht (USPN 5,654,519). Claims 3-6 and 9-12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 21-24 and 27-30 were allowed.

Applicants and applicants' attorney acknowledge with appreciation the allowance of claims 21-24 and 27-30 and the indication of allowability concerning claims 3-6 and 9-12.

In accordance with this amendment, allowable dependent claims 3 and 9 have been rewritten in independent form to incorporate the subject matter of base claim 1, thereby placing claims 3 and 9 in allowable form. Claims 1, 2 and 37-50 have been canceled without prejudice or admission.

Claims 4-6 depend on allowable claim 3 and are thus likewise allowable. Similarly, claims 10-12 depend on allowable claim 9 and are thus likewise allowable.

As a result of these amendments, the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1, 2 and 37-50 have been canceled.

Claims 21-24 and 27-30 stand allowed.

Allowable dependent claims 3 and 9 have been rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of base claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable.

Claims 4-6 and 10-12 depend on allowable claims 3 and 9, respectively, and are therefore also allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made herein do not raise any new issue that would require further search or consideration. To the contrary, the amendments made herein do, on their face, place the application in condition for allowance.

In the event the Examiner determines that something further need be done to place the application in allowable form, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney whereupon any outstanding matter will be promptly attended to.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and entry of this amendment together with passage of the application to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ADAMS & WILKS  
Attorneys for Applicants

By: Bruce L. Adams

Bruce L. Adams  
Reg. No. 25,386

17 Battery Place  
Suite 1231  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 809-3700

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1451, Alexandria, VA 22313-1451, on the date indicated below.

Thomas Tolve

Name

T. Tolve

Signature

July 27, 2007

Date